

RECEIVED

0272

SEP 05 2001

550729

1 MR. MICHAELSON: I think we owe a vote of
2 appreciation to the two facilitators who have stood at
3 this podium over there. They've shown a certain amount
4 of courtesy --

5 (APPLAUSE)

6 And have had a very difficult job. They've
7 kept the process moving.

8 However, as a private citizen, I come here
9 not representing anybody. I don't have a job at stake.
10 I don't have a consultant fee at stake. I only come
11 here to represent myself, and I think I'm typical of
12 the state of Nevada.

13 As the 132nd person to sign up asking for
14 speaker time here, I think it's appropriate to note
15 that it's now 2:00 a.m. in the morning, and we've been
16 at this process some eight hours, I believe it is. And
17 over half of the speakers appeared to have left. I
18 think it should be noted that when you report to your
19 Washington senior personnel, that the adequacy of time
20 didn't, even allowing five minutes, certainly was not
21 enough to do it all in one day.

22 Now I'd like to talk for just a minute about

550729

23 a principle of democracy. In this country, since the
24 founding fathers debated the establishment of our form
25 of government, there was two principles that seemed to
0273

1 be pulling in opposite directions. One is that the
2 rule should be by the majority, whatever the majority
3 decided would be the course of action. The other is
4 that despite the rule of the majority, that the rights
5 of the individual and the rights of the minority should
6 be observed and be given credence to and protected.

7 We have, of course, just one state here
8 that's being, as dumped upon. The state of Nevada,
9 somewhat 1 1/2 to 2 million people that we have here
10 and the other 5,000, 6,000 a month that move in here.
11 We're a minority, and our rights are not being
12 protected as they should be in a government, a republic
13 such as we have created in this country by the founding
14 fathers, and such we hope to preserve and protect for
15 the future. I think the rights of the people and the
16 will of the people of the state of Nevada should be
17 given very important consideration, and if the people
18 here do not want it, we should not have to take it.
19 I'm concerned about --

20 (APPLAUSE)

550729

21 And I -- if we look at the list of speakers
22 or the types of people, we should find there's two
23 general groups that have spoken here tonight. There
24 have been those that have vested interests, because of
25 employment, consultant fees, or profit they hope to
0274

1 make on bringing the dump here. There are those that
2 have been funded by nuclear energy industry or their
3 allies, or those that want to have money.

4 On the other side of the fence, those that
5 oppose seem to be the people that live here and the
6 people that are in the majority, and the elected
7 representatives of those people who have listened to
8 the people speak know their sentiments and their
9 feelings and have expressed their opposition. Not only
10 here, but continually over the years.

11 So I think we have to determine the validity
12 of the decision-making process. Should it be by the
13 will of the people, or should it be by those with
14 vested interests? I have a number of relatives, number
15 of friends that are involved in the health care
16 industries and hospitals in Nevada, and in the

17 surrounding states, including the University of Utah
18 Medical School that was mentioned here earlier. And in
19 discussion with them over the last 20 years, about the
20 inflow of patients that come in, particularly the young
21 children. A frequently heard phrase, almost weekly,
22 here's another young child, with leukemia, or cancer,
23 or some disease as a result of nuclear radiation. They
24 are hopeful in that industry, the health industry, that
25 that trend will diminish.

0275

1 But we are proposing to move nuclear waste
2 around the country without fear that any of it will
3 contaminate anybody. And I think that's a fear that
4 should be given great credence to. Man has not created
5 any invention, any system of transportation, any
6 mechanical, electronic or nuclear device that at some
7 time or another has not failed. Now you can look at
8 train accidents, truck accidents, cars, ships, nuclear
9 submarines, space probes, unmanned space probes,
10 Challengers, and whatever. Every endeavor that man has
11 created or invented sooner or later fails or creates an
12 accident or a hazard. And sooner or later, we will
13 have these accidents and hazards throughout our nation

550729

550729

14 in these. We've seen the maps of the transportation
15 routes, and the, almost the whole country's affected
16 and will be put at risk. When it does not need to be.
17 Storage can be on site. Storage can be in these
18 100-year containers, while we work out the other
19 problems, the scientific problems.

20 MODERATOR BROWN: 30 seconds or so.

21 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. I'm concerned
22 that in this 5-minute process that we've all been
23 limited to here, that some very knowledgeable people
24 with scientific backgrounds did not have opportunity to
25 present all of the information they came here prepared
0276

1 to present, on both sides of the question, and
2 particularly on those that were opposed to the nuclear
3 dump. Again, that speaks to the inadequacy of this
4 hearing process, and the need to expand it so that all
5 people can have their input. The process of making
6 these decisions has been spoken somewhat critically as
7 being a political decision. And from a political
8 science class, from a very knowledgeable professor, I
9 learned that political decisions are an attempt to
10 ascertain the will of the people, and make decisions in

550729

11 the best interests of the people. And the best
12 interests of the people of Nevada is that we do not
13 have this repository here. And in the best interests
14 of all the people in all the states and all the routes
15 and all the communities and all the towns and all the
16 railroad sidings, and all of the cities and all the
17 industrial areas that these routes pass through and all
18 these transportation hubs, whether it be Las Vegas,
19 Salt Lake City, Denver, Chicago, whatever, or even the
20 country town, if you like to, nobody wants to have the
21 accident happen in their city or their town.

22 Now with a million and a half people here,
23 2 million probably shortly down the road in 10 years,
24 there's about that many people in the Washington, D.C.
25 area. Why not put that nuclear dump within 70 miles of
0277

1 Washington, D.C.? And subject that same number of
2 people to the same risks that they propose, or any
3 other location in the country. It would not be
4 acceptable there. It's not acceptable here. And I
5 think we should all continue our fight to oppose the
6 nuclear repository in the state of Nevada. Thank you.